

**REMARKS-General**

1. The newly drafted independent claims 50 and 59 incorporate all structural limitations of the amended claims 27 and 37 and include further limitations previously brought forth in the disclosure. No new matter has been included. All new claims 50-66 are submitted to be of sufficient clarity and detail to enable a person of average skill in the art to make and use the instant invention, so as to be pursuant to 35 USC 112.

**Response to Rejection of Claims 27-49 under 35USC112**

2. The applicant submits that the newly drafted claims 50-66 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the instant invention, as pursuant to 35USC112.

**Response to Rejection of Claims 27-49 under 35USC103**

3. The Examiner rejected claims 27-49 over Hagiwara et al (US 6,878,766) in view of no other cited art. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 103:

“(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is **not identically** disclosed or described as set forth in **section 102 of this title**, if the **differences** between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the **subject matter as a whole would have been obvious** at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.”

4. In view of 35 U.S.C. 103(a), it is apparent that to be qualified as a prior art under 35USC103(a), the prior art must be cited under 35USC102(a)~(g) but the disclosure of the prior art and the invention are not identical and there are one or more differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art. In addition, such differences between the subject matter sought to be patented **as a whole** and the prior art are obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

5. In other words, the differences between the subject matter sought to be patent as a whole of the instant invention and Hagiwara et al which is qualified as prior art of

the instant invention under 35USC102(b) are obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

6. Applicant submits that the set of new claims 50 through 66 overcome the 35USC 103(a) rejection. Accordingly, applicant believes that for all of the foregoing reasons, all of the claims are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

**The Cited but Non-Applied References**

7. The cited but not relied upon references have been studied and are greatly appreciated, but are deemed to be less relevant than the relied upon references.

8. In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are requested. Allowance of claims 50-66 at an early date is solicited.

9. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed in order to place the application in condition for allowance, he is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Raymond Y. Chan', is written over a horizontal line.

Raymond Y. Chan  
Reg. Nr.: 37,484  
108 N. Ynez Ave.  
Suite 128  
Monterey Park, CA 91754  
Tel.: 1-626-571-9812  
Fax.: 1-626-571-9813